UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,077	10/26/2001	Tod Turner	01-40169-US (882397.20001	9530

7066 7590 10/11/2005

REED SMITH LLP
2500 ONE LIBERTY PLACE
1650 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER	
BATES, KEVIN T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/015,077	TURNER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Bates	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-93* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-93* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on August 29, 2005.

Claims 11 and 19 have been amended and overcome the 35 USC § 112 rejection.

Claims 1-93 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 5-6, 16-17, 20-21, 23-24, 34-36, 39, 41-42, 44, and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gudjonsson (6564261).

Regarding claim 1, Gudjonsson teaches a method for communicating hosted application information to allow sharing of a hosted application session (Column 7, lines 44 – 57), comprising the steps of: instantiating a first instant messaging client on a first network access device (Column 3, lines 1 – 13), said first network access device being remote from a hosted application server (Column 3, lines 14 – 22), said first network access device participating in a hosted network application (Column 3, lines 38 – 45); establishing a communications path from the first network access device to a second

network access device (Column 3, lines 46 – 57), said second network access device running a second instant messaging client, said second instant messaging client being communicably connected to said first instant messaging client via a network, said communications path for communicating information using an instant messaging protocol between the first and second network access devices (Column 3, lines 49 – 57); and using an instant messaging protocol to communicate hosted application information to the second network access device, said information comprising parameters for sharing the hosted application session being participated in by the first network access device (Column 19, lines 45 – 59).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Gudjonsson teaches that said hosted application information is masked to prevent said information from being readily discernible by a user of the first or second network access device (Column 10, lines 28 – 33).

Regarding claim 6, Gudjonsson teaches a method for communicating hosted application information to allow sharing of a hosted application session (Column 7, lines 44 – 57) comprising the steps of: instantiating a first instant messaging client on a first network access device (Column 3, lines 1 – 13), said first network access device being remote from a hosted application server (Column 3, lines 14 – 22), said first network access device participating in a hosted network application (Column 3, lines 38 – 45); establishing a communications path from the first network access device to a second network access device (Column 3, lines 46 – 57), said second network access device running a second instant messaging client, said second instant messaging client being

communicably connected to said first instant messaging client via a network (Column 3, lines 49 – 57); and receiving a request to issue an invitation from the first network access device to the second network access device, said invitation inviting a user of the second network access device to participate in a shared hosted application session through the second network access device (Column 9, lines 8 – 22).

Regarding claim 24, Gudjonsson teaches a method for communicating hosted application information to allow sharing of a hosted application session (Column 7, lines 44 – 57) comprising the steps of: instantiating a first instant messaging client on a first network access device (Column 3, lines 14 – 22), said first network access device being remote from a hosted application server (Column 3, lines 14 – 22), said first network access device participating in a hosted network application (Column 3, lines 38 – 45); establishing a communications path from a second network access device to the first network access device (Column 3, lines 46 – 57), said second network access device having a second network connection, said network connection having a bandwidth, said second network access device further running a second instant messaging client, said second instant messaging client being communicably connected to said first instant messaging client via the network connection (Column 3, lines 49 – 57), said communications path for communicating hosted application information using an instant messaging protocol between the first and second network access devices (Column 2, lines 20 – 22); and receiving at the first network access device a request from the second network access device, said request requesting communication of hosted network application information to the second network access device to allow the

second network access device to participate in a shared hosted application session (Column 9, lines 8 – 22, where the request from the second device is the affirmative response from an invitation started by the first device).

Regarding claim 42, Gudjonsson teaches a method for providing assistance for a hosted application to an accessor of the hosted application from a support network access device (Column 7, lines 44 – 57, where Gudjonsson teaches two or more users, but it can clearly have one of the user being an accessor), comprising the steps of: instantiating an instant messaging client on a network access device being used by the accessor (Column 3, lines 1 – 13); instantiating an instant messaging client on a support network access device (Column 3, lines 14 – 22); receiving a support request from the accessor network access device, said accessor network access device accessing a hosted application from a remote location, said request being a request for assistance for an on-going hosted application session (Column 27, lines 62 – 67); communicating to the support network access device hosted application information using an instant messaging protocol (Column 2, lines 20 – 22), said hosted application information comprising information for allowing the support network access device to share the ongoing hosted application session; and instantiating an access to the on-going hosted application session on the support network access device, said access causing the hosted application session to become shared with the support network access device (Column 9, lines 8 – 22).

Regarding claims 16, 34, and 47, which are dependent on claims 6, 24, and 42, Gudjonsson teaches that said hosted network application information is masked to

prevent said information from being readily discernible by a user of the second network access device (Column 10, lines 28 – 33).

Regarding claims 17, 35, and 49, which are dependent on claims 16, 34, and 42, Gudjonsson teaches that said hosted application information is encrypted while being communicated to the second network access device (Column 8, lines 23 – 34).

Regarding claims 20, 36, and 48, which are dependent on claims 16, 34, and 42, Gudjonsson teaches that said hosted application information is masked to prevent said information from being readily discernible by a user of the first network access device (Column 10, lines 28 – 33).

Regarding claims 21, 39, and 44, which are dependent on claims 6, 24, and 42, Gudjonsson teaches that said hosted application information comprises role information for defining a participants authority to interact with a shared hosted application (Column 27, line 62 – Column 28, line 8).

Regarding claims 23, 41, and 46, which are dependent on claims 21, 39, and 44, Gudjonsson teaches that wherein a user is associated with a network access device, said user having an identity (Column 2, lines 53 – 62), and wherein said role information is dependant on the identity of the user (Column 27, line 62 – Column 28, line 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-10, 13-15, 22, 25-28, 31-33, 40, 45, 52, 54-68, 70-83, and 88-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudjonsson in view of Salesky (6343313).

Regarding claim 52, Gudjonsson teaches a method for providing a hosted application training session, said training session including shared access to a hosted application session between at least one trainer and at least one trainee (Column 7, lines 44 – 57, where Gudjonsson teaches two or more users, but it can clearly have one of the user being a trainee and another a trainer), said method comprising the steps of: instantiating a hosted application session from a trainer's network access device (Column 3, lines 1 – 13), said hosted application session hosted by a remote hosted application server (Column 3, lines 14 – 22), said trainer's network access device being connected to a communications network, said remote hosted application server also being connected to the network; instantiating an instant messaging client on the at least one trainer's network access device; instantiating an instant messaging client on at least one trainee's network access device, said network access device having a trainee's connection to the communications network, said trainee's network connection having a bandwidth (Column 3, lines 49 – 57); communicating to the at least one trainee's network access device hosted application information, said hosted application information comprising information allowing the at least one trainee's network access device to share a hosted application training session (Column 9, lines 8 – 22)

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate communicating to the at least one trainee's network access device a capability verification request; determining whether said at least one trainee's network access device is capable of participating in a shared hosted application training session; and when it is determined that said at least one trainee's network access device is capable of participating in a shared hosted application session.

Salesky teaches a system for sharing a hosted application which includes transferring capability information and determining whether an application can be shared by said network access devices (Column 3, lines 4 – 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claim 68, Gudjonsson teaches a method for providing a shared hosted application session, wherein said session is shared among a plurality of shared hosted application participants (Column 7, lines 44 – 57); comprising the steps of: instantiating a hosted application session on a first network access device associated with a first application participant (Column 3, lines 38 – 45), said hosted application session being hosted by an application hosting server (Column 3, lines 14 – 22); instantiating an instant messaging client on said first network access device (Column 3, lines 1 – 13); using said instant messaging client to establish a communications path to

at least a second network access device associated with at least a second participant (Column 3, lines 46 – 57), said second network access device having a second connection to the network, said second network connection having a bandwidth; communicating to the at least second participant via the communications path an invitation to share the hosted application session (Column 3, lines 49 – 57); determining whether the at least second participant desires to participate in a shared hosted application session; when it is determined that said second network access device is capable of participating in a shared hosted application session and that said at least second participant desires to participate in a shared hosted application session, communicating to said second network access device hosted application information, said hosted application information for allowing said second network access device to share a hosted application session (Column 9, lines 8 – 22); and when it is determined that said at least second participant desires to participate in a shared hosted application session, instantiating an access to the shared application session on said at least second network access device in accordance with the communicated hosted application information (Column 19, lines 45 – 59).

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate communicating to the at least one trainee's network access device a capability verification request; determining whether said at least one trainee's network access device is capable of participating in a shared hosted application training session; and when it is determined that said at least one trainee's network access device is capable of participating in a shared hosted application session.

Salesky teaches a system for sharing a hosted application which includes transferring capability information and determining whether an application can be shared by said network access devices (Column 3, lines 4 – 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claim 83, Gudjonsson teaches a computer-readable medium tangibly embodying instructions which, when executed by a network access device, implement a process comprising the steps of: causing an instant messaging service to be instantiated on a first network access device, said first network access device having a first network connection to a network (Column 3, lines 38 – 45); causing the instantiated instant messaging service to establish a communications path with a remote network access device, said remote network access device having a second network connection to a the network (Column 3, lines 14 – 22); receiving at the first network access device hosted application information (Column 3, lines 17 – 22); and when said hosted application information indicates an available hosted application, attempting to establish a hosted application session with the available hosted application (Column 18, lines 15 – 23).

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate communicating to the at least one trainee's network access device a capability verification request; determining whether

said at least one trainee's network access device is capable of participating in a shared hosted application training session; and when it is determined that said at least one trainee's network access device is capable of participating in a shared hosted application session.

Salesky teaches a system for sharing a hosted application which includes transferring capability information and determining whether an application can be shared by said network access devices (Column 3, lines 4 – 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claims 60 and 74, which are dependent on claims 52 and 68, Gudjonsson teaches that said hosted network application information is masked to prevent said information from being readily discernible by a user of the second network access device (Column 10, lines 28 – 33).

Regarding claims 61, 63, 75, 77, 79, and 89, which are dependent on claims 52, 68, and 83, Gudjonsson teaches that said hosted application information is encrypted while being communicated to the second network access device (Column 8, lines 23 – 34).

Regarding claims 62, 76, and 78, which are dependent on claims 52 and 68, Gudjonsson teaches that said hosted application information is masked to prevent said

information from being readily discernible by a user of the first network access device (Column 10, lines 28 – 33).

Regarding claims 64, 80, and 90, which are dependent on claims 52, 68, and 83, Gudjonsson teaches that said hosted application information comprises role information for defining a participants authority to interact with a shared hosted application (Column 27, line 62 – Column 28, line 8).

Regarding claim 91, which is dependent on claim 83, Gudjonsson teaches the step of controlling interaction between a computer executing the process and a shared hosted application (Column 27, line 62 – Column 28, line 8).

Regarding claims 66, 67, 82, 92, and 93, which are dependent on claims 64, 80, and 91, Gudjonsson teaches that wherein a user is associated with a network access device, said user having an identity (Column 2, lines 53 – 62), and wherein said role information is dependant on the identity of the user (Column 27, line 62 – Column 28, line 8).

Regarding claims 7-9, 25-27, and 58-59, which are dependent on claims 6, 24, and 52, Gudjonsson teaches deciding whether to send the invitation to the second network device based on his preference,

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate the step of determining whether a hosted application is shareable.

Salesky teaches a system for sharing a hosted application which includes transferring capability information and determining whether an application can be shared by said network access devices (Column 3, lines 4 – 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claims 10, 28, 57, 73, and 88, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 9, 27, 52, 68, and 83.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate determining whether the second network access device has compatible hosted application sharing software installed.

Salesky teaches determining whether the second network access device has compatible hosted application sharing software installed (Salesky, Column 1, lines 41 – 42; Column 3, lines 6 – 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claims 13, 31, 54, and 70, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 6, 24, 52, and 68.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate that some determination being dependant upon the performance capability of the network access device

Salesky teaches that some determination being dependant upon the performance capability of the network access device (Salesky, Column 1, lines 41 – 42; Column 3, lines 6 – 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claims 14, 32, 55, and 71, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 13, 31, 54, and 70.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate the determination is dependant upon a graphical display resolution of the network access device.

Salesky teaches that said the determination is dependant upon a graphical display resolution of the network access device (Salesky, Column 3, line 1 – 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claims 15, 33, 56, and 72, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 6, 31, 54, and 70.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate the determination is dependant upon the bandwidth of the network connection between the network access device and the hosted application server.

Salesky teaches that the determination is dependant upon the bandwidth of the network connection between the network access device and the hosted application server (Salesky, Column 3, lines 1 – 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claims 22, 40, 45, 65, and 81, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 21, 39, 44, 64, and 80.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate that said role information may be used to alternate control of a shared hosted application session between a first network access device and a second network access device.

Salesky teaches that there are roles in a shared application system and that control can alternate (Column 8, lines 55 – 57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's teaching of alternating control in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow more than one person to have control and have a viewable screen in a conference (Column 8, lines 55 – 67).

Claims 2-4, 18-19, 37-38, and 50-51 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudjonsson in view of Slavin (6675193).

Regarding claims 2-4, 18, 37, and 50, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 1, 16, 34, and 42.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate that said hosted application information comprises port information, protocol information, and authorization information for accessing a hosted application session to be shared.

Slavin teaches a shared application system (Column 3, lines 20 – 25) and teaches that the application information sent to the client should include port information, protocol information, and authorization information for accessing a hosted application session (Column 8, lines 16 – 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to use Slavin's teachings in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow a Gudjonsson's system work over HTTP as well as more protocols (Column 8, lines 10 – 15).

Regarding claims 19, 38, 51, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 18, 37, and 50.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate said access authorization information is unique to a hosted application sharing session.

Slavin teaches that said access authorization information is unique to a hosted application sharing session (Slavin, Column 8, lines 10 – 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to use Slavin's teachings in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow a Gudjonsson's system work over HTTP as well as more protocols (Column 8, lines 10 – 15).

Claim 11-12, 29-30, 43, 53, 49 and 84-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudjonsson in view of Salesky as applied to claims 7-10, 13-15, 22, 25-28, 31-33, 40, 45, 52, 54-68, 70-83, and 88-93 above, and further in view of Danneels (5524110).

Regarding claims 11-12, 29-30, 43, 53, 69, and 84, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 9, 27, 24, 42, 52, 68, and 83.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate that said capability verification request comprises application server port information, and wherein said determination of whether said at least one trainee's network access device is capable of participating in a shared hosted application training session comprises determining whether the at least one trainee's network access device is capable of communicating with the hosted application server via the application server port information.

Danneels teaches an application sharing system which includes testing a clients capability ability before it issues any invitations or allows it to conference (Column 66, lines 20 – 31) and that a host server can validate the capability of the client and the connection ability of the client (Column 66, lines 10 – 13) and that the test goes though the communication port (Column 67, lines 27 – 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gudjonsson's instant messaging service/application sharing system with Danneels teaching of verifying the ability of a new node to operate within the limits of the application sharing in order to know before any conference is initiated whether the node can properly participate in any type of conferencing (Column 66, lines 8 – 13).

Regarding claim 85, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claim 84.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate that some determination being dependant upon the performance capability of the network access device.

Salesky teaches that some determination being dependant upon the performance capability of the network access device (Salesky, Column 1, lines 41 – 42; Column 3, lines 6 – 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claim 86, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 85.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate the determination is dependant upon a graphical display resolution of the network access device.

Salesky teaches that said the determination is dependant upon a graphical display resolution of the network access device (Salesky, Column 3, line 1 – 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Regarding claim 87, Gudjonsson teaches the method of claims 85.

Gudjonsson does not explicitly indicate the determination is dependant upon the bandwidth of the network connection between the network access device and the hosted application server.

Salesky teaches that the determination is dependant upon the bandwidth of the network connection between the network access device and the hosted application server (Salesky, Column 3, lines 1 – 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Salesky's system for negotiating and determining capabilities in a shared hosted application system in Gudjonsson's system in order to allow the devices to share an application even if they have differing hardware and software (Column 1, lines 36 – 42).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the reference, Gudjonsson, does not disclose the use of an instant messaging protocol for communicating information relating to hosted application information. The examiner disagrees, Gujonsson

discloses a system that improves chatting and instant messaging by having an immediate service between end users (Column 3, lines 46 – 51) with each end user using an instant message program (Column 3, lines 14 – 16) and communication with an instant messaging protocol (Column 2, lines 20 – 21) and the immediate node communicates application information to the end users for services and sessions using the protocol (Column 19, lines 45 – 59) and that the system is configured to improve upon instant messaging services by adding the immediate services and masking that can increase the security and allow the messaging service to perform the advanced services (Column 2, lines 44 – 48; lines 62 – 67).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER